

Online Appendix for “Leader Survival, Sources of Political Insecurity, and International Conflict”

Forthcoming in *Political Research Quarterly*

Matthew DiLorenzo
Old Dominion University
mdiloren@odu.edu

Contents

A	Notes on Disaster Data	2
B	Summary Statistics	3
C	Polity <i>xrreg</i> variable	4
D	Including Total Aid and Civil Conflict	5
E	Zero-inflated Negative Binomial Regression Models	7
F	Controlling for Disaster Propensity	8
G	Correlations Between Key Variables	9
H	Empirical Distribution of Regime and Removal Type	10
I	Alternative Dependent Variable: ICB Crisis Initiations	11
J	Cross Tabulation of Disaster Deaths and MID Initiations	12
K	Alternate measure of probability of irregular removal	16

A Notes on Disaster Data

Temporal and Spatial Domains

The following countries/territories are included in EM-DAT but are either not included in *Archigos*, not included in the Correlates of War data set, or do not have coding in the Bueno de Mesquita et al. 2003 *W* score data, and are excluded from the analysis: American Samoa, Anguilla, Azores, Bermuda, Canary Islands, Cayman Islands, Cook Islands, Ethiopia, French Guiana, French Polynesia, Guadeloupe, Guam, Macau, Martinique, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, New Caledonia, Niue, Northern Mariana Islands, Palestine (West Bank), Puerto Rico, Reunion, Serbia, St Helena, Tokelau, Turks and Caicos Islands, Virgin Islands (UK), Virgin Islands (US), Wallis, Wallis and Futuna Islands. There are three cases that did not appear in the EM-DAT data but do appear in Archigos: Qatar, United Arab Emirates, and Republic of Vietnam. I include Qatar and United Arab Emirates in the analysis because they both appear in the EM-DAT online database even though they have no disasters listed during the temporal domain of this study. Dealing with the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) is less straightforward, because EM-DAT does not distinguish between Vietnam and South Vietnam pre-1975, while Archigos has observations for Vietnam and South Vietnam pre-1975. For this reason, I excluded the Republic of Vietnam from the analysis, as well as all pre-1975 years for Vietnam, since it is not possible to distinguish whether disasters occurred in Vietnam or Republic of Vietnam before 1975.

Coding Disaster Deaths and Events

Though the database always records the year that a disaster started, many observations list the start day as '00' in the data, and some list the start month as '00'. I treat these cases as if the disaster occurred on the first day of the month (or on the first day of the year if both are missing). The data are aggregated by total deaths per disaster. Accordingly, to contribute to the overall count of disaster deaths for a given leader-year, I require only that the disaster *started* during that leader-year. Disaster end dates are far less precise than start dates in EM-DAT. Often only a month and year is listed, while some cases list only the year. For countries with no disasters listed during a year, I code these values as zero so long as the country appears in the data set in other years.

Why Not Use a Measure of Economic Damage?

While economic damage might have an effect similar to deaths, empirical measures of economic damage may not reliably convey the extent of a disaster's economic impact. For example, the International Disaster Database records that Libya experienced \$42.2 million in disaster damages in 1995. Yet, Cohen and Werker (2008, 811) note that insurance covered these damages, so the extent of the loss is not clear from the \$42.2 million figure. Alternative data sets of economic damage may provide more fine-grained estimates of economic losses (e.g., Neumayer, Plümper and Barthel 2014), but for the purposes of this project, they do not necessarily provide any better estimate of disasters' effects on the confidence of the winning coalition in the leader. Deaths from disasters, which are permanent and more readily visible, should serve as a clearer signal of leader competence. Quiroz Flores and Smith (2013) also use this measure as an indicator of disasters' impacts on human security.

B Summary Statistics

Table 4: Summary Statistics

Statistic	N	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
<i>mids_init</i>	6,843	0.199	0.648	0	23
<i>hh_mids_init</i>	6,843	0.131	0.543	0	23
<i>ln_deaths_t1</i>	6,843	1.342	2.262	0.000	14.510
<i>ln_events_t1</i>	6,843	0.462	0.654	0.000	3.638
<i>eq_events_t1</i>	6,843	0.108	0.470	0	10
<i>lwc_i</i>	6,843	0.360	0.480	0	1
<i>lwc_r</i>	6,843	0.381	0.486	0	1
<i>lwc_i_75</i>	6,843	0.092	0.289	0	1
<i>lwc_r_75</i>	6,843	0.377	0.485	0	1
<i>small</i>	6,843	0.260	0.438	0	1
<i>peace_years_mid</i>	6,843	19.581	45.204	1	191
<i>leader_tenure</i>	6,843	8.644	7.381	2	49
<i>ln_realgdp</i>	6,843	10.333	1.914	4.873	16.373
<i>ln_land</i>	6,843	12.274	1.784	6.554	16.612
<i>cinc</i>	6,843	0.007	0.021	0.00001	0.319

Key

mids_init: Count of MIDs initiated in year t

hh_mids_init: Count of MIDs with hostility ≥ 4 initiated in year t

ln_deaths_t1: Natural log of disaster deaths in year $t - 1$

ln_events_t1: Natural log of disaster events in year $t - 1$

eq_events_t1: Earthquake events in year $t - 1$

lwc_i: Large-coalition, irregular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.5$)

lwc_r: Large-coalition, regular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.5$)

lwc_i_75: Large-coalition, irregular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.75$)

lwc_r_75: Large-coalition, regular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.75$)

small: Small-coalition system (threshold $W < 0.5$)

peace_years_mid: Number of consecutive years without MID prior to year t

leader_tenure: length of time in years that leader has been in office up to year t

ln_realgdp: Natural log of real GDP in year $t - 1$

ln_land: Natural log of land area in square kilometers

cinc: CINC score for country in year $t - 1$

C Polity *xrreg* variable

The Polity codebook (Marshall, Jaggers and Gurr 2010, 21) describes the second category of *xrreg* as follows:

(2) Designational/Transitional: Chief executives are chosen by designation within the political elite, without formal competition (i.e., one-party systems or ‘rigged’ multi-party elections). Also coded here are transitional arrangements intended to regularize future power transitions after an initial unregulated seizure of power (i.e., after constitutional legitimization of military rule or during periods when the leader of the coup steps down as head of state but retains unrivaled power within the political realm as head of the military). This category also includes polities in transition from designative to elective modes of executive selection (i.e., the period of ‘guided democracy’ often exhibited during the transition from military to civilian rule) or vice versa (i.e., regimes ensuring electoral victory through the intimidation of oppositional leaders or the promulgation of a ‘state of emergency’ before executive elections).

In short, a score of ‘2’ indicates that the institutionalization of leader accession is fragile (at best), and leaders of these systems are likely more concerned about irregular removal from office than leaders in regimes that score ‘3.’

D Including Total Aid and Civil Conflict

Here I report the results for some alternative models that include measures that may cause problems with post-treatment bias. Aid may reduce disaster impacts and countries may be less likely to engage in provocative international behavior when they are dependent on external assistance. I use the log of the sum of aid commitments (in constant US\$) from the project-level data provided by *AidData* (Tierney et al. 2011). Since Nelson (2010) argues that the association between disasters and international conflict results from the worsening of violent internal conflict which spills over into international conflict, I include a count of civil conflicts in the previous year using the UCDP-PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset v.4-2014 (Gleditsch et al. 2002). However, since these variables potentially intervene between the key independent and dependent variables, I omit these measures from the main analysis. The results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5: Controlling for Aid and Civil Conflict

	<i>Dependent variable: MID Initiations</i>			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Deaths (log)	0.002 (0.030)	0.024 (0.022)	-0.044 (0.027)	-0.011 (0.019)
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R)	-0.409*** (0.152)		-0.771*** (0.116)	
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I)	-0.089 (0.126)		-0.155 (0.097)	
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R, $W \geq 0.75$)		-0.558*** (0.142)		-0.811*** (0.103)
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I, $W \geq 0.75$)		-0.688*** (0.210)		-0.856*** (0.196)
CINC	13.121*** (2.710)	13.441*** (2.707)	8.526*** (1.292)	8.877*** (1.292)
Land area (km ² , log)	0.096*** (0.032)	0.080** (0.032)	0.084*** (0.025)	0.076*** (0.025)
Real GDP (log)	0.213*** (0.033)	0.226*** (0.033)	0.184*** (0.027)	0.191*** (0.027)
Population	-0.00000*** (0.00000)	-0.00000*** (0.00000)	-0.00000* (0.00000)	-0.00000* (0.00000)
Leader Tenure	-0.019*** (0.006)	-0.024*** (0.006)	-0.014*** (0.005)	-0.019*** (0.005)
Peace Years	-0.013*** (0.003)	-0.013*** (0.002)	-0.015*** (0.002)	-0.014*** (0.002)
Aid Commitments (log)	-0.092*** (0.019)	-0.089*** (0.019)		
Aid Commitments (log, missing = zero)			0.002 (0.005)	0.003 (0.005)
Civil Conflict	0.447*** (0.042)	0.443*** (0.042)	0.389*** (0.036)	0.388*** (0.035)
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-R	-0.007 (0.041)		0.061* (0.034)	
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-I	0.060 (0.039)		0.074** (0.034)	
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-R ($W \geq 0.75$)		-0.032 (0.033)		0.020 (0.027)
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-I ($W \geq 0.75$)		0.108* (0.057)		0.152*** (0.053)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-I Leaders	0.06* (0.027)	0.13* (0.05)	0.03 (0.02)	0.14* (0.05)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-R Leaders	-0.005 (0.03)	-0.008 (0.03)	0.017 (0.02)	0.009 (0.023)
Constant	-3.613*** (0.803)	-3.459*** (0.802)	-4.472*** (0.464)	-4.434*** (0.461)
Observations	4,419	4,419	6,843	6,843
Log Likelihood	-2,007.165	-1,999.524	-3,228.590	-3,216.975
θ	0.958*** (0.128)	0.966*** (0.129)	0.842*** (0.087)	0.851*** (0.088)
Akaike Inf. Crit.	4,134.331	4,119.047	6,595.181	6,571.950

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

E Zero-inflated Negative Binomial Regression Models

A potential concern is that conflict is sufficiently rare to make estimating the relationship between disasters and conflict difficult because of excessive zeros for the conflict variable(s). I address this using zero-inflated negative binomial regression models. The problem with using this model is that it assumes that there are multiple processes that generates zeros for the outcome variable. In the context of this paper, this means that I would have to assume that some leaders are restricted to be at peace for some reason. It is not clear that there are conditions that prevent some leaders from initiating conflicts or making threats, and, as such, it is unclear whether this model is appropriate. However, it is possible that having a weak military would cause a leader to be unable to initiate conflicts. I reestimate the main models using the CINC score as the inflation factor. The zero-inflated negative binomial regression models produces results similar to those reported in Table 1. Though the results are only statistically significant at the 80% confidence level in Model 1, they are in the same direction of those reported in the main text. However, in Model 2, which uses the $W \geq 0.75$ threshold to separate large- from small-coalition leaders, the results are statistically significant for leaders facing irregular removal but not regular removal.

Table 6: Zero-inflated Negative Binomial Regression Models

	<i>Dependent variable: MIDs Initiated</i>	
	$W \geq 0.75$	
	(1)	(2)
Deaths (log)	-0.068** (0.028)	-0.020 (0.018)
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R)	-0.724*** (0.115)	
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I)	-0.314*** (0.100)	
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R, $W \geq 0.75$)		-0.653*** (0.105)
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I, $W \geq 0.75$)		-0.773*** (0.202)
CINC	9.826*** (1.353)	10.195*** (1.357)
Land area (km ² , log)	0.054** (0.027)	0.056** (0.027)
Real GDP (log)	-0.128*** (0.039)	-0.109*** (0.040)
Population (log)	0.187*** (0.046)	0.156*** (0.046)
Leader Tenure	-0.021*** (0.005)	-0.025*** (0.005)
Peace Years	-0.013*** (0.002)	-0.013*** (0.002)
Disaster Deaths (log) × LC-R	0.098*** (0.033)	
Disaster Deaths (log) × LC-I	0.097*** (0.034)	
Disaster Deaths (log) × LC-R ($W \geq 0.75$)		0.051** (0.026)
Disaster Deaths (log) × LC-I ($W \geq 0.75$)		0.176*** (0.053)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-I Leaders	0.03 (0.02)	0.16* (0.05)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-R Leaders	0.03 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)
Constant	-2.394*** (0.558)	-2.436*** (0.557)
Observations	6,843	6,843
Log Likelihood	-3.205.441	-3.201.884

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Zero inflation factor in inflation stage (not shown) is the CINC variable.

F Controlling for Disaster Propensity

To account for the possibility that some countries are more prone to experience disasters in ways that would affect the relationship between disasters and leader survival, I control for the disaster propensity of a country. To construct this measure, I take the natural log of disaster events in a given country for all years before and including year $t - 2$. The results are reported in Table 7. Though the results weaken in Model 1, they are similar to the findings in the baseline model in the main text (and in the same direction). Still, it is not clear that past disaster propensity would affect a country's propensity for initiating international conflicts, especially since disaster responses may have failed under past administrations or institutional settings.

Table 7: Controlling for Disaster Propensity (Negative Binomial Regression)

	Dependent variable:	
	mids.init	
	(1)	(2)
Deaths (log)	-0.038 (0.028)	-0.009 (0.019)
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R)	-0.863*** (0.115)	
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I)	-0.271*** (0.096)	
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R, $W \geq 0.75$)		-0.842*** (0.103)
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I, $W \geq 0.75$)		-0.897*** (0.196)
CINC	5.154*** (1.304)	5.402*** (1.305)
Land area (km ² , log)	0.094*** (0.024)	0.088*** (0.025)
Real GDP (log)	0.167*** (0.026)	0.168*** (0.026)
Population	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)
Leader Tenure	-0.014*** (0.005)	-0.020*** (0.005)
Peace Years	-0.016*** (0.002)	-0.016*** (0.002)
Disaster Events Up to Year $t - 2$ (log)	0.078** (0.039)	0.085** (0.040)
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-R	0.076** (0.034)	
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-I	0.069** (0.034)	
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-R ($W \geq 0.75$)		0.042 (0.027)
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-I ($W \geq 0.75$)		0.159*** (0.053)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-I Leaders	0.031 (0.023)	0.15* (0.05)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-R Leaders	0.037 (0.023)	0.032 (0.023)
Constant	-4.257*** (0.481)	-4.247*** (0.479)
Observations	6,843	6,843
Log Likelihood	-3,268.984	-3,258.342
θ	0.818*** (0.088)	0.828*** (0.089)
Akaike Inf. Crit.	6,673.968	6,652.685

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

G Correlations Between Key Variables

Table 8 reports correlations between the key independent variables used in the analysis.

Table 8: Correlations Between Independent Variables

	<i>ln_deaths_t1</i>	<i>lwc_r</i>	<i>lwc_i</i>	<i>lwc_r_75</i>	<i>lwc_i_75</i>	<i>small</i>	<i>cinc</i>	<i>ln_land</i>	<i>ln_realgdp</i>	<i>pop</i>	<i>leader_tenure</i>	<i>peace_yrs_mid</i>	<i>ln_aid_commitments</i>	<i>civil_conflict_t1</i>
<i>ln_deaths_t1</i>	1	0.079	-0.061	0.076	0.029	-0.043	0.272	0.307	0.337	0.378	-0.009	-0.176	0.327	0.228
<i>lwc_r</i>	0.079	1	-0.595	0.992	-0.264	-0.482	0.106	-0.040	0.369	0.052	-0.305	-0.021	0.061	0.030
<i>lwc_i</i>	-0.061	-0.595	1	-0.590	0.448	-0.417	-0.044	0.057	-0.174	0.017	0.160	-0.002	0.055	-0.086
<i>lwc_r_75</i>	0.076	0.992	-0.590	1	-0.261	-0.476	0.105	-0.039	0.367	0.052	-0.301	-0.021	0.060	0.032
<i>lwc_i_75</i>	0.029	-0.264	0.448	-0.261	1	-0.184	-0.058	-0.044	-0.071	-0.043	-0.061	0.028	0.032	-0.022
<i>small</i>	-0.043	-0.482	-0.417	-0.476	-0.184	1	-0.130	-0.009	-0.253	-0.093	0.182	0.031	-0.130	0.066
<i>cinc</i>	0.272	0.106	-0.044	0.105	-0.058	-0.130	1	0.371	0.512	0.637	-0.066	-0.114	0.111	0.058
<i>ln_land</i>	0.307	-0.040	0.057	-0.039	-0.044	-0.009	0.371	1	0.473	0.338	-0.045	-0.349	0.348	0.167
<i>ln_realgdp</i>	0.337	0.369	-0.174	0.367	-0.071	-0.253	0.512	0.473	1	0.417	-0.101	-0.320	0.264	0.121
<i>pop</i>	0.378	0.052	0.017	0.052	-0.043	-0.093	0.637	0.338	0.417	1	-0.033	-0.101	0.243	0.298
<i>leader_tenure</i>	-0.009	-0.305	0.160	-0.301	-0.061	0.182	-0.066	-0.045	-0.101	-0.033	1	-0.022	-0.069	-0.010
<i>peace_yrs_mid</i>	-0.176	-0.021	-0.002	-0.021	0.028	0.031	-0.114	-0.349	-0.320	-0.101	-0.022	1	-0.231	-0.116
<i>ln_aid_commitments</i>	0.327	0.061	0.055	0.060	0.032	-0.130	0.111	0.348	0.264	0.243	-0.069	-0.231	1	0.183
<i>civil_conflict_t1</i>	0.228	0.030	-0.086	0.032	-0.022	0.066	0.058	0.167	0.121	0.298	-0.010	-0.116	0.183	1

Key

ln_deaths_t1: Natural log of disaster deaths in year $t - 1$

ln_events_t1: Natural log of disaster events in year $t - 1$

eq_events_t1: Earthquake events in year $t - 1$

lwc_i: Large-coalition, irregular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.5$)

lwc_r: Large-coalition, regular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.5$)

lwc_i_75: Large-coalition, irregular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.75$)

lwc_r_75: Large-coalition, regular removal system (threshold $W \geq 0.75$)

small: Small-coalition system (threshold $W < 0.5$)

peace_yrs_mid: Number of consecutive years without MID prior to year t

leader_tenure: length of time in years that leader has been in office up to year t

ln_realgdp: Natural log of real GDP in year $t - 1$

ln_land: Natural log of land area in square kilometers

cinc: CINC score for country in year $t - 1$

pop: Population (in thousands)

ln_aid_commitments: Logged total aid commitments from AidData

civil_conflict_t1: Number of civil conflicts in previous year

H Empirical Distribution of Regime and Removal Type

Table 9 reports the empirical distribution of removal type for my coding of regime type using the main $W \geq 0.5$ threshold. To create this table, I reduced the data set to only the last years that leaders were in office, recording the removal type as I have coded it, along with how the leader actually lost office as coded by Goemans, Gleditsch and Chiozza (2009). Though large-coalition leaders face irregular removal less often than small-coalition leaders, my coding of regular versus irregular removal within large-coalition systems still captures this distinction within large-coalition regimes. Only 9% of large-coalition, regular removal leaders lost office through irregular means, while 27% of large-coalition, irregular removal leaders lost office through irregular means. So, while in both groups irregular removal happens less often than it does in small-coalition systems, clearly there is a non-trivial risk of irregular removal for the leaders I have coded as ‘large-coalition, irregular removal.’ The table also shows that the coding scheme also seems to capture a meaningful distinction in removal types within small-coalition regimes. The same is true in Table 10 which uses the alternative threshold of $W \geq 0.75$ to separate large- from small-coalition systems, though the differences are less pronounced.

Table 9: Empirical Distribution of Regime and Removal Type, $W \geq 0.5$ Threshold

	Foreign	Irregular	Natural Death	Regular	Retired Due to Ill Health	Still in Office	Suicide	Unknown
Large, Irregular	0.020	0.270	0.100	0.600	0.010	0	0	0
Large, Regular	0	0.090	0.030	0.850	0.020	0	0	0
Small, Irregular	0.020	0.510	0.050	0.400	0.020	0	0	0
Small, Regular	0.020	0.260	0.280	0.400	0.040	0	0	0

Table 10: Empirical Distribution of Regime and Removal Type, $W \geq 0.75$ Threshold

	Foreign	Irregular	Natural Death	Regular	Retired Due to Ill Health	Still in Office	Suicide	Unknown
Large, Irregular	0.010	0.140	0.020	0.820	0.010	0	0	0
Large, Regular	0	0.090	0.030	0.850	0.020	0	0	0
Small, Irregular	0.030	0.420	0.100	0.430	0.020	0	0	0
Small, Regular	0.030	0.260	0.260	0.420	0.030	0	0	0

I Alternative Dependent Variable: ICB Crisis Initiations

To provide an alternative measure of conflict behavior, Table 11 reports the results of using a count of ICB crisis initiations (Brecher and Wilkenfeld 1997) rather than MID initiations. The results in the baseline model are no longer statistically significant, though the direction of the estimates are the same as in the main text. However, in the model that uses the alternative W threshold (Model 2), there is a statistically significant effect of disasters, only in large-coalition, irregular removal systems. In both models, the coefficient for disasters in large-coalition regular removal systems is close to zero and not statistically significant.

Table 11: Alternative Dependent Variable: ICB Crisis Initiations (Negative Binomial Regression)

	<i>Dependent variable: ICB Crisis Initiations</i>	
	(1)	$W \geq 0.75$ (2)
Disaster Deaths (log)	-0.026 (0.048)	-0.004 (0.034)
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R)	-0.246 (0.194)	
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I)	-0.484*** (0.175)	
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal (LC-R, $W \geq 0.75$)		-0.110 (0.175)
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal (LC-I, $W \geq 0.75$)		-1.708*** (0.606)
CINC	7.669*** (1.756)	8.007*** (1.786)
Land area (km ² , log)	0.173*** (0.044)	0.171*** (0.044)
Real GDP (log)	-0.003 (0.045)	-0.005 (0.045)
Population	0.00000 (0.00000)	0.00000 (0.00000)
Leader Tenure	-0.013 (0.010)	-0.020** (0.010)
Peace Years	-0.017*** (0.004)	-0.017*** (0.004)
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-R	0.054 (0.060)	
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-I	0.037 (0.064)	
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-R ($W \geq 0.75$)		0.029 (0.046)
Disaster Deaths (log) \times LC-I ($W \geq 0.75$)		0.270* (0.140)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-I Leaders	0.011 (0.044)	0.26* (0.14)
$\hat{\beta}_{DisasterDeaths}$ for LC-R Leaders	0.028 (0.037)	0.025 (0.037)
Constant	-38.274 (6,728,023.000)	-38.113 (4,791,973.000)
Observations	6,843	6,843
Log Likelihood	-1,146.755	-1,144.605
θ	2.135 (1.318)	2.058* (1.238)
Akaike Inf. Crit.	2,427.510	2,423.211

Note:

* $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

J Cross Tabulation of Disaster Deaths and MID Initiations

Table 12 reports the raw counts and percentage of observations where leaders in each of the large-coalition categories initiated at least one MID following a year with less than the mean number of disaster deaths and more than the mean number of disaster deaths.

Table 12: Distribution of MID Cases for Large-Coalition Leaders

Regime, Removal Type	Zero MIDs	MIDs > 0	% MID Cases
Large-Coalition, Irregular (Deaths \leq Mean)	1609	223	0.069
Large-Coalition, Irregular (Deaths >Mean)	504	132	0.21
Large-Coalition, Regular (Deaths \leq Mean)	1494	154	0.052
Large-Coalition, Regular (Deaths >Mean)	769	200	0.21

Table 13 lists the cases in the data where large-coalition leaders initiated at least one MID following a year where disasters killed an above-average number of people in the leader's country. Table 14 does the same for large-coalition regular removal leaders.

Table 13: Cases of MID Initiations for Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal Leaders with Greater than Mean Disaster Deaths in Previous Period

leader	cocode	idacr	year				
1 Berisha	339	ALB	1997	67	Khatami	630	IRN 2005
2 Duvalier, Francois	41	HAI	1963	68	Menderes	640	TUR 1952
3 Ruiz Cortines	70	MEX	1956	69	Menderes	640	TUR 1958
4 Laugerud Garcia	90	GUA	1977	70	Evren	640	TUR 1982
5 Azcona Hoyo	91	HON	1989	71	Ozal	640	TUR 1986
6 Callejas	91	HON	1991	72	Ozal	640	TUR 1987
7 Reina	91	HON	1995	73	Ozal	640	TUR 1988
8 Anastasio Somoza Debayle	93	NIC	1977	74	Ozal	640	TUR 1989
9 Alarcon Fabian	130	ECU	1998	75	Sadat	651	EGY 1980
10 Fujimori	135	PER	1995	76	Mubarak	651	EGY 1993
11 Geisel	140	BRA	1975	77	Mubarak	651	EGY 1995
12 Figueiredo	140	BRA	1983	78	Mubarak	651	EGY 1996
13 Kadar	310	HUN	1971	79	Bashar al-Assad	652	SYR 2005
14 Husak	315	CZE	1986	80	Rakhmonov	702	TAJ 1998
15 Georgievski	343	MAC	2002	81	Rakhmonov	702	TAJ 2006
16 Milosevic	345	YUG	1991	82	Akayev	703	KYR 1993
17 Milosevic	345	YUG	2000	83	Karimov	704	UZB 1993
18 Zhivkov	355	BUL	1987	84	Karimov	704	UZB 1999
19 Yeltsin	365	RUS	1993	85	Nazarbayev	705	KZK 1996
20 Yeltsin	365	RUS	1994	86	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1952
21 Yeltsin	365	RUS	1995	87	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1955
22 Yeltsin	365	RUS	1996	88	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1956
23 Yeltsin	365	RUS	1997	89	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1958
24 Yeltsin	365	RUS	1998	90	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1960
25 Yeltsin	365	RUS	1999	91	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1965
26 Putin	365	RUS	2001	92	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1975
27 Putin	365	RUS	2002	93	Mao Tse-Tung	710	CHN 1976
28 Putin	365	RUS	2003	94	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1985
29 Putin	365	RUS	2005	95	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1986
30 Putin	365	RUS	2006	96	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1987
31 Putin	365	RUS	2007	97	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1988
32 H. Aliyev	373	AZE	1996	98	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1993
33 H. Aliyev	373	AZE	2001	99	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1994
34 Taylor	450	LBR	2000	100	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1995
35 Biya	471	CAO	1987	101	Deng Xiaoping	710	CHN 1996
36 Biya	471	CAO	1994	102	Jiang Zemin	710	CHN 1999
37 Biya	471	CAO	1995	103	Jiang Zemin	710	CHN 2001
38 Biya	471	CAO	1998	104	Jiang Zemin	710	CHN 2002
39 Biya	471	CAO	2005	105	Hu Jintao	710	CHN 2004
40 Patasse	482	CEN	2001	106	Hu Jintao	710	CHN 2005
41 Mobutu	490	DRC	1977	107	Hu Jintao	710	CHN 2007
42 Mobutu	490	DRC	1978	108	Chiang Ching-Kuo	713	TAW 1987
43 Joseph Kabila	490	DRC	2007	109	Lee Teng-Hui	713	TAW 1991
44 Kenyatta	501	KEN	1978	110	Lee Teng-Hui	713	TAW 1995
45 Moi	501	KEN	1995	111	Rhee	732	ROK 1958
46 Mwinyi	510	TAZ	1995	112	Chun Doo Hwan	732	ROK 1983
47 Mkapa	510	TAZ	2000	113	Chun Doo Hwan	732	ROK 1985
48 Mkapa	510	TAZ	2002	114	Chun Doo Hwan	732	ROK 1986
49 Gouled Aptidon	522	DJI	1998	115	Roh Tae Woo	732	ROK 1991
50 Dos Santos	540	ANG	1988	116	Kim Young Sam	732	ROK 1996
51 Dos Santos	540	ANG	2001	117	Prem	800	THI 1987
52 Dos Santos	540	ANG	2002	118	Mahatir Bin Mohammad	820	MAL 1988
53 Dos Santos	540	ANG	2005	119	Mahatir Bin Mohammad	820	MAL 1992
54 Machel	541	MZM	1986	120	Mahatir Bin Mohammad	820	MAL 2003
55 Kaunda	551	ZAM	1983	121	Ahmad Badawi	820	MAL 2004
56 Levy Mwanawasa	551	ZAM	2004	122	Ahmad Badawi	820	MAL 2005
57 Ayatollah Khomeini	630	IRN	1984	123	Ahmad Badawi	820	MAL 2006
58 Ayatollah Khomeini	630	IRN	1987	124	Marcos	840	PHI 1979
59 Ayatollah Khomeini	630	IRN	1988	125	Marcos	840	PHI 1982
60 Rafsanjani	630	IRN	1991	126	Sukarno	850	INS 1957
61 Rafsanjani	630	IRN	1992	127	Sukarno	850	INS 1964
62 Rafsanjani	630	IRN	1993	128	Megawati Sukarnoputri	850	INS 2003
63 Rafsanjani	630	IRN	1994	129	Megawati Sukarnoputri	850	INS 2004
64 Rafsanjani	630	IRN	1995	130	Ahmadinejad	630	IRN 2007
65 Rafsanjani	630	IRN	1996	131	Bakiyev	703	KYR 2005
66 Rafsanjani	630	IRN	1997	132	Bakiyev	703	KYR 2006

K Alternate measure of probability of irregular removal

In the main text I use the Polity *xrreg* variable to proxy for irregular removal. Here I present an alternate model that instead uses a dummy variable that indicates whether at least 25% of the leader transitions that occurred in the past 20 years in a given country occurred through irregular means as an alternative indicator of “irregular” removal. The results do weaken here, and it is actually large-coalition, regular removal leaders that are significantly more likely to initiate conflicts in the wake of disasters, not those facing irregular removal. However, the direction of the coefficient estimates is consistent with the results reported in the main text. Counting the number of irregular removals in the past one or two decades involves taking into account information about patterns in removal that may have occurred under different institutional systems (or that occurred during transitions to new institutional systems). The *xrreg* variable records institutions of leader transition for a given “polity” in a given year in a way that should avoid giving undue weight to patterns of leader removal that may have prevailed under past institutional systems. Given these concerns, using the Polity *xrreg* variable seems more defensible from a research design standpoint.

Table 15: Marginal Effect of Disasters on Conflict Initiation by Coalition Size, 1950 - 2008 (Alternate estimate of irregular removal)

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>
	MIDs initiated
Small-Coalition	-0.022 (0.027)
Large-Coalition, Irregular Removal	0.04 (0.08)
Large-Coalition, Regular Removal	0.04* (0.02)
Observations	6,843
Log Likelihood	-3,291.217
θ	0.750*** (0.077)
Akaike Inf. Crit.	6,716.435

Note: * $p < 0.05$. † $p < 0.10$

Estimated standard errors in parentheses.

Negative binomial regression model.

Model also includes CINC score, land area (sq. km, log),

real GDP log, population (thousands),

time in office, peace years, and year dummies.